



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Am  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/457,267	12/09/1999	NAOMI IWAYAMA	1359.1020	7493
21171	7590	05/27/2005	EXAMINER	
STAAS & HALSEY LLP SUITE 700 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			YUAN, ALMARI ROMERO	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2176	

DATE MAILED: 05/27/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	09/457,267	IWAYAMA, NAOMI
	Examiner Almari Yuan	Art Unit 2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 March 2005.  
 2a) This action is **FINAL**.      2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1,2,5 and 7-12 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 1, 2, 5, and 7-12 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is responsive to communications: Request for RCE and Amendment filed on 3/22/05.
2. Claim 12 is newly added. Claims 1, 2, 5, and 7-12 are pending. Claims 1, 8, 9, and 12 are independent claims.

***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

3. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 3/22/05 has been entered.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. **Claims 1-2 and 8-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,005,498 to Yang et al., issued December 21, 1999, filed October 29,**

**1997 in view of Japanese Patent Application Publication Number Hei 7 (1995)-129572 A of Matsushita Electric Industrial Co., Ltd, partial translation provided by applicant in the Information Disclosure Statement filed February 11, 2003 (hereinafter "Matsushita"), and in further view of U.S. Patent Number 5,896,321 to Miller et al., issued April 20, 1999, filed November 14, 1997.**

**Regarding independent claims 1, 8, and 9**, Yang et al. (herein after "Yang") discloses:

A device for entering a character string into a character string processing device (Yang in Fig. 2 and on col. 1, lines 5-6: teaches a keypad used for entering Chinese characters):

an input part allowing a user to enter the character string to be entered into the character string processing device (Yang in Fig. 2, block 210 and col. 2, lines 63-34 teaches a keypad for input);

an input situation acquiring part for acquiring a situation peculiar to current input processing among a plurality of situations (Yang on col. 3, lines 15-17 teaches a MENU key that allows the user to select a "pinyin entry" option) of character string that has been started or an activated program, on the character string processing device (Yang on col. 2, lines 39-59 and col. 6, lines 1-4 teaches a reduced entry keypad to allow Chinese characters to be efficiently entered);

a candidate character string generation part for generating and outputting an output candidate string in response to a character string entered with the input part (Yang on col. 4, line 63 - col. 5, line 7 teaches after a user presses the OK key 386 to indicate that the word is completely entered, the microprocessor 220 shown in FIG. 2 initiates a search through the

dictionary 244 in ROM 240 for all possible Chinese characters associated with the entered phonetic syllable .... The eligible Chinese characters are loaded into the RAM 250 for display.)

a candidate character string affirmation processing part for affirming the outputted candidate character string (Yang on col. 5, lines 51-54 teaches character selection key);

an affirmed character string storing part for storing a character string that has been affirmed (Yang on col. 5, lines 61-64 teaches if a character selection key was pressed as determined by step 460, the display 230 is cleared and the selected character is displayed and entered into the RAM 250 shown in FIG. 2).

However, Yang does not explicitly teach “a situation control part for affirming a dictionary used for generating a candidate character string and designating it as a situation-optimized dictionary”, “generating a string that is optimal for the situation using the situation-optimized dictionary”, and “affirming one of a plurality of dictionaries, the affirmed dictionary or the affirmed part of the dictionary”.

Matsushita teaches a dictionary selection part that selects a special dictionary based on the acquiring situation inasmuch as factors include the time of input (Matsushita translation, p. 2, line 9: "using times") and context (Matsushita translation, p. 2, lines 9-11: "the arranged order of the respective special dictionary [presumably, dictionaries] recorded in the dictionary usage recording part."). Furthermore, it is obvious that when selecting a dictionary, the dictionary is selected among a plurality of dictionaries and the selected dictionary is the affirmed one.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Matsushita into Yang to provide a way to select a special dictionary based on the input, as taught by Matsushita, incorporated into the search through the

dictionary, as taught by Yang (see col. 4, lines 65-67), in order to allow dictionaries containing words for special disciplines to be used where appropriate (Matsushita, col. 2, lines 4-7.)

However, Yang and Matsushita do not explicitly teach "updating the contents of the situation-optimized dictionary dynamically".

Miller et al. (herein after "Miller") teaches updating a dynamic dictionary by adding confirmed data entries (On col. 9, lines 19-23).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Miller into Yang and Matsushita to provide a way to update a dynamic dictionary, as taught by Miller, incorporated into the dictionary of Yang and Matsushita, in order to provide the benefit of allowing the system to adaptively learn in response to user-defined entries (Miller on col. 9, lines 4-6).

**Regarding dependent claims 2 and 10-11,** Yang discloses:

information relating to a user inputting the character string inasmuch as Yang et al. teach a "pinyin entry" option (on col. 3, lines 15-17).

**Regarding independent claim 12,** claim 12 incorporates substantially similar subject matter as claimed in claims 1, 8, and 9, and is rejected along the same rationale.

6. **Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yang, Matsushita, and Miller, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Japanese Patent Application Publication Number Hei 9 (1997)-6771 A of Canon, Inc., partial translation provided by applicant in the Information Disclosure Statement filed November 13, 2002**

**(hereinafter "Canon"), and further in view of U.S. Patent Number 5,829,023 to Bishop, issued October 27, 1998, filed April 24, 1996.**

**Regarding dependent claim 5**, Yang, Matsushita, and Miller disclose the invention substantially as described as claimed in *supra*.

However, Yang, Matsushita, and Miller do not explicitly teach "storing a last-access date of an affirmed character string when storing the string" and "using the last-access date when generating the output candidate character string".

Canon teaches reading "the date and time of registration" of a string in a dictionary (Canon Abstract, CONSTITUTION, line 6), which inherently required that the date and time be stored when the string was stored and teaches determining whether information in a dictionary has been accessed recently enough to be valid for use (Canon translation of page 3, lines 22-26).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Canon into Yang, Matsushita, and Miller to provide a way to read the date and time of registration of a string in a dictionary and determining whether the information in a dictionary has been access recently, as taught by Cannon, incorporated into the entering and searching of a character string or word in a dictionary, as taught by Yang, Matsushita, and Miller, in order to recognize the most recently-entered strings that would be most likely to be relevant to users and enabling automatic removal items from a dictionary.

Further, Yang, Matsushita, Miller, and Canon do not teach "changing the last-access date of an already-stored string when it is accessed".

Bishop teaches maintaining a file attribute containing information concerning the date and frequency of use of a particular file (On col. 4, lines 19-21).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Bishop into Yang, Matsushita, Miller, and Canon to provide a way to maintain a file attribute containing information concerning the date and frequency of use of a particular file, as taught by Bishop, incorporated into dictionary of Yang, Matsushita, Miller, and Canon, in which users would be most likely to want to access files (or strings) which they had most recently accessed.

**7. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yang, Matsushita, Miller, Canon, and Bishop, as applied to claims 1-2, 5, 8-12 above, further in view of Japanese Patent Application Publication Number Sho 61-32186, published February 14, 1986, partial translation provided in applicants' Information Disclosure Statement filed February 28, 2000 (hereinafter "Hitachi"), and further in view of Japanese Patent Application Publication Number Hei 9-179859, published December 12, 1995, partial translation provided in applicants' Information Disclosure Statement filed February 28, 2000 (hereinafter "Just Syst").**

**Regarding dependent claim 7, Yang, Matsushita, Miller, Canon, and Bishop do not teach "associating character strings that are used in a pre-existing electronic text with information relating to a user creating the electronic text".**

Hitachi suggests "associating character strings with the user creating the electronic text" on the translation of page 4, lines 1-9 teaches storing different content for different user so as to increase processing efficiency.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Hitachi into Yang, Matsushita, Miller, Canon, and Bishop to provide a way to store different content for different users, as taught by Hitachi, incorporated into the entering of text or characters in a computer environment of Yang, Matsushita, Miller, Canon, and Bishop, in order to increase processing efficiency.

However, Yang, Matsushita, Miller, Canon, Bishop, and Hitachi do not teach “information relating to a character string processing apparatus by which the electronic text has been created”.

Just Syst teaches processing a character string according to the device into which it has been inputted (Just Syst, translation of page 2, lines 8-10).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Just Syst into Yang, Matsushita, Miller, Canon, Bishop, and Hitachi to provide a way to process a character string according to the device into which it has been inputted, as taught by Just Syst, incorporated into the entering of text or characters in a computer environment of Yang, Matsushita, Miller, Canon, Bishop, and Hitachi, in order to recognize that different devices have different requirements for entering strings.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

8. Applicant's arguments filed 3/22/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding Applicant's remarks on page 6:

The Examiner has used Matsushita to teach the amended feature "affirming one of a plurality of dictionaries...". Matsushita teaches selecting a special dictionary based on the acquiring situation (on p. 2, lines 9-11). Therefore, it would have been obvious for Matsushita to have a plurality of dictionaries to select from.

*Conclusion*

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Almari Yuan whose telephone number is 571-272-4104. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays - Fridays (8:30am - 5:00pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Feild, can be reached on 571-272-4090. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

AY  
May 24, 2005



JOSEPH FEILD  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER